arXiv:1701.02443v1 [math.CO] 10 Jan 2017

A New and Efficient Framework for the Graph Isomorphism Problem

Ameneh Farhadian *

Abstract

This paper provides a new framework to study graph structure. It enables us to define graph orthogonality and a new metrics on graphs. Furthermore, it enables us to define the coordinate representation of graphs with respect to an ordered set of graphs, which benefits us in the graph isomorphism problem. If any graph of set A has a unique coordinates with respect to a graph set B, then, we call B is a basis for the graphs set A. Having a basis, any graph finds a unique coordinates. Thus, the graph isomorphism problem equals to comparison of the coordinates. This fact provides a formal approach to study the computational complexity of the graph isomorphism problem, i.e. finding a suitable basis.
We have shown that graphs on at most $3\log n$ vertices make a basis for almost every n-vertex graphs. This fact, easily, results that graph isomorphism problem can be solved in $\exp(6\log^2 n)$ time for almost every pair of n-vertex graphs.

Keywords: graph isomorphism problem, quasi-polynomial time, graph orthogonality, graph dot product, graph metrics, graph coordinate representation, computational complexity.

1 Introduction

Graph isomorphism problem and its derivatives, such as graph matching[5] (in pattern recognition) and graph similarity problem have numerous applications in many areas such as biology, chemistry[14], pattern recognition[5] and web structure mining[4, 6]. Graph matching has been the topic of numerous studies in computer science over the last decades. In graph matching problem, the goal is to find maximum corresponding regions in graphs which match. The graph isomorphism is in fact an exact graph matching. In the graph similarity problem, the main interest is to assign an overall similarity score to indicate

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, Sharif University of Technology, P. O. Box 11155-9415, Tehran, I. R. Iran a_farhadian@mehr.sharif.ir

the level of similarity between two graphs[21]. Maximum common subgraph[2], edit distance methods [11] and measuring distance based on some operations [10] are some approaches to compare the similarity of two graphs. Another approach is using graph kernels[12, 17].
Solving the graph isomorphism problem and related problems, entirely, based on our perception or insight to graph structure. Therefore, the main step towards effective solution of these problems is having a good framework to represent graphs.

This paper provides a new framework to analyze a graph structure. The graph space is equipped by a dot product which makes it possible to have a coordinate representation for graphs. Furthermore, the defined dot product donates a new metric to graph space and, also, introduces the orthogonality of graphs. This framework brings us a better sense about graph structure which benefits us in graph isomorphism, subgraph isomorphism problem or graph matching in pattern recognition.

Representing graphs by adjacency matrix, entirely, depends on the vertices ordering. Hence, a graph finds different presentations, due to different reordering of its vertices. This fact stimulates us to ask if there is any other conceptual description of graphs which is unique for all isomorphic graphs. We want such description to be based on the graph structure instead of defining the edges state which, extremely, depends on vertices ordering. A complete set of graph invariants is such a conceptual description of graphs. Graph spectrum is, roughly, what we want, but it does not specify each graph isomorphism class, uniquely, and the relation of a graph structure and its spectrum is not very clear. To know more about spectral methods in graph matching see[3, 16, 20, 19].

Usually, the smooth function $F : (a, b) \longrightarrow R$ is defined by giving the value of function on each points of the domain. Also, it is possible to describe it in terms of the basis functions coefficients, such as $sin(.)$ and $cos(.)$ functions. In general, another way to define a function F is the Fourier series representation. Although, the Fourier series presentation always is not easy, but it sometimes provides some facilities which makes some complicated problems trivial. Fourier series presentation offers a conceptual and structural view of functions which is the base of some technologies such as optics, telecommunications and mechanics engineering(vibration). Having not such representation, we have not nowadays telecommunications!

The representation of a functions in terms of the basis functions provides a clear and conceptual view which enables us to be more strong dealing with functions, either in theory or applications. Can we develop such tool dealing with graphs? The first questions which, naturally, arise are

- How can we define a basis for graphs?
- How can we measure a graph is close to a basis element or not?

We answer these questions in this paper and define a coordinate representation for graphs.
If any n-vertex graph has a unique coordinates with respect to a graph set B, then, we call B is a basis for n-vertex graphs. We show that graphs with at most $3\log n$ vertices are a basis for n-vertex graphs. This, simply, results that the graph isomorphism problem, almost always, can be solved in $\exp(6\log n)$ time.

In the second section, the suggested framework is drawn by defining graphs dot product, graph metrics, graph coordinate representation and graph basis. The third section explains how to use this new framework for the graph isomorphism problem and its derivatives, in theory or application.

2 Dot product of graphs

The set of graphs is not a Hilbert space to have a dot product. But, we need something like that to be able to to define some basis and to measure how a graph is close to basis elements. The idea of kernel function embeds the set of graphs in a larger Hilbert space which is equipped by a dot product[18, 12, 17]. Here, we want to define something like a dot product on any pairs of n-vertex graphs, directly.

Let Γ_n be the set of n-vertex graphs. We define a dot product on Γ_n. We wish this dot product measures the structural resemblance of any two graphs. It produces 1 when two graphs are isomorphic and tends to zero when two graphs are really different in structure.
In this paper, the matrix representation of a graph G is an $n \times n$ matrix A_G in which there exists $+1$ in (i, j) entry when v_i and v_j are adjacent and -1 otherwise ($i \neq j$). Diagonal elements are zero. Before dot product, the scaler product for graphs is defined which will be used in the following.

Definition 1 *Let G be a simple graph and $r \in R$.*
rG is a weighted graph, where the weight $e_{u,v}$ is $+r$ for adjacent $\{u, v\}$ in G and is $-r$, otherwise. The matrix representation of rG is rA_G where A_G is the matrix representation of the graph G.

Definition 2 *[9] Let A_G, A_H be, respectively, the matrix representations of two n-vertex graphs G and H. We define*

$$G.H := \frac{1}{N} trace(A_G P A_H P^T)$$

Where P is a permutation matrix which makes $|trace(A_G P A_H P^T)|$ maximum and $N = 1/n(n-1)$.

The above dot product is defined in a natural way. A graph is permuted to other graph as long as the best placement, maximum number of edge on edge and not edge on not edge assignment, to be found. Two graphs match exactly, when they are isomorphic. We emphasize that this dot product is not exactly a real dot product. But, it is something like a dot product which has desired properties. For instance, it enables us to find a metrics on graphs. Following propositions are resulted directly from the definition.

Proposition 1 *Let G and H be two arbitrary graphs on n vertiecs. Then,*

a) $G.H = H.G$.

b) $rG.H = G.rH = r(G.H)$.

c) $G.H = \overline{G}.\overline{H}$.

d) $G.\overline{H} = \overline{G}.H = -G.H$.

e) $G.H = 1$ *if and only if* $G \cong H$.

f) $G.H = -1$ *if and only if* $G \cong \overline{H}$. $\square$

The dot product of graphs on 4 vertices is shown in table 1. We see -1 on the minor diagonal which indicates the complement pair of graphs.

It is valuable to note that the number of permutation matrices which results in maximum value in the definition of dot product conveys some information about the graph structure. We will see in the following that this information is essential to determine a graph from its coordinates. Thus, it is valuable to consider this number.

Definition 3 $Phase(G.H) = |\{P|\frac{1}{N}trace(A_G P A_H P^t) = G.H\}|$

Additionally, to find the maximum value of $|trace(A_G P A_H P^t)|$, we are ought to check all the permutation matrices. Thus, knowing $Phase(G.H)$ does not impose any more computational load, at all, when we compute $G.H$.

Now, we define graph orthogonality. This new concept opens a new window to our perception about graph structure. Here, we restrict ourselves to definition. But, the study of orthogonal graphs seems to be essential to make our understanding complete about graph structure.

Definition 4 *Two n-vertex graphs G and H are orthogonal, if $G.H = 0$ or $\pm 1/n(n-1)$.*

For $n \neq 4k, 4k+1$, it is not possible to have $G.H = 0$. Thus, the minimum possible value, i.e. $1/n(n-1)$, is considered. For $n = 4k, 4k+1$, the value 0 is possible, while $1/n(n-1)$ is not possible. When we try to put two orthogonal graphs on another, at most half of the edge to edge assignments are successful (edge on edge and not edge on not edge), that is the same value that we obtain by a randomized placement. Two orthogonal graphs are shown in Fig. 1.

	1	2/3	1/3	1/3	0	0	0	-1/3	-1/3	-2/3	-1
	2/3	1	2/3	2/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-1	-2/3
	1/3	2/3	1	1/3	-2/3	2/3	2/3	1/3	-1	-2/3	-1/3
	1/3	2/3	1/3	1	0	2/3	0	-1	1/3	-2/3	-1/3
	0	1/3	-2/3	0	1	1/3	-1	0	-2/3	-1/3	0
	0	1/3	2/3	2/3	1/3	1	1/3	2/3	2/3	1/3	0
	0	1/3	2/3	0	-1	1/3	1	0	-2/3	-1/3	0
	-1/3	-2/3	1/3	-1	0	2/3	0	1	1/3	2/3	1/3
	-1/3	-2/3	-1	1/3	-2/3	2/3	-2/3	1/3	1	2/3	1/3
	-2/3	-1	-2/3	-2/3	-1/3	1/3	-1/3	2/3	2/3	1	2/3
	-1	-2/3	-1/3	-1/3	0	0	0	1/3	1/3	2/3	1

Table 1: The dot product of 4-vertex graphs

Two graphs are orthogonal if and only if $trace(A_G P A_H P^t)$ is invariant to the selection of matrix P and it, constantly, equals to zero (or $1/n(n-1)$). This reveals the perfect different structure of these two graphs.



Figure 1: A pair of orthogonal graphs

Proposition 2 *Let G and H be two arbitrary graphs.*

a) $Phase(G.G) = Phase(G.\overline{G}) = |Aut(G)|$.

b) $Phase(G.H)$ is divisible by $|Aut(H)|$ and $|Aut(G)|$.

c) $Phase(G.H) = n!$, if and only if G and H are orthogonal. $(G, H \ncong K_n, \overline{K_n})$

Proof:a) It follows from the definition.
b) Let Q be an arbitrary $n \times n$ permutation matrix. Clearly, the value of $trace(A_G P A_H P^t)$ is invariant for any $P = P_1 Q P_2$ where $P_1 \in Aut(G)$ and $P_2 \in Aut(H)$. Thus, the set of $n \times n$ permutation matrices is partitioned into different equivalence classes which all elements of each class results in the same value of $trace(A_G P A_H P^t)$. Therefore, $phase(G.H)$ is divisible by $Aut(H)$ and it takes at most $n!/|Aut(H)|$ different values.
c) When we try to put two orthogonal graphs on other at most half of the edges placement is successful (edge on edge and not edge on not edge), it means the same value that we obtain by a randomized placement. Therefore, any placement is the best and acceptable, i.e. any of the n! permutations. Vice versa, if any placement is the best, one of graph is K_n (or $\overline{K}_n$) or they are orthogonal.□

2.1 The metric space of graphs

Some different distances are defined on graphs which only some of them are metrics. For instances, some metrics are defined in [21, 2] which are based on maximum common subgraph. In [15], a metric is defined for the cut of graphs. Here, we introduce a metric on graphs using the defined dot product which is capable to reflect the structure similarity of graphs.

Definition 5 *We define for any two n-vertex graphs G and H*

$$d(G,H) := \frac{1}{2}(\|G\|^2 + \|H\|^2 - 2G.H) = 1 - G.H$$

where $\|G\| = \sqrt{G.G}$.

Theorem 1 *d is a metric on the set of isomorphism classes of n-vertex graphs.*

Proof: We should check the following properties hold true for any graphs G, G_1, G_2 and H

1. $d(G,H) \geq 0$
2. $d(G,H) = 0$ if and only if $G \cong H$
3. $d(G_1,G_2) \leq d(G_1,H) + d(G_2,H)$

The first and second items are trivial. We prove the third one. To compute the dot product of two graphs G and H, we should permute H or $\overline{H}$ on G until the best placement to be found. The best placement is a placement with maximum number of successful assignment of edges. An edge to edge assignment is successful, if a black(white) edge is assigned to a black(white) edge. It is easy to check that the number of unsuccessful edge to edge assignments in the best

placement of two graphs is $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}(1 - G.H)$.
Let $\pm P$ and $\pm Q$ be the matrix representation of permutations which results in the best placement of G_1 on H and G_2 on H, respectively. The sign of these matrices indicate that a graph is considered or its complement. Because, to compute $G.H$, graph H or its complement is permuted on G. The matrix $\pm PQ^{-1}$ is a permutation matrix. When we put G_1 on G_2 by this permutation, we have at most $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}[(1 - G_1.H) + (1 - H.G_2)]$ number of unsuccessful edge to edge assignments. This permutation is not necessary the best one. Hence, for the best permutation, that is the permutation corresponds to $d(G_1, G_2)$ value, we have fewer number of unsuccessful edge to edge assignments. Therefore, $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}(1 - G_1.G_2) \leq \frac{n(n-1)}{2}[(1 - G_1.H) + (1 - H.G_2)]$. Thus, we have $d(G_1, G_2) \leq d(G_1, H) + d(G_2, H)$. □

Corollary 1 *$d'(G, H) := \sqrt{(\|G\|^2 + \|H\|^2 - 2G.H)}$ is also a metric on the set of isomorphism classes of n-vertex graphs.* □

The definition of d, directly follows

Proposition 3 $d(G_1, G_2) = d(\overline{G_1}, \overline{G_2})$

2.2 Dot product of graphs with different order

Here, the graph dot product is extended for graphs with different order. In subgraph algebra [13, 7], merely the number of a subgraph of a graph is counted. Here, there is a more general approach. The new defined dot product is the same previous dot product for graphs with the same order, but with a normalizing factor.

Definition 6 *Let A_G, A_H be, respectively, the matrix representations of two graphs G and H. We define*

$$G.H := trace(A_G P A_H P^T)$$

Where P is a permutation matrix which makes $|trace(A_G P A_H P^T)|$ maximum. If $|V(G)| \neq |V(H)|$, we add extra zero rows and columns to the smaller matrix to have two matrices with the same size.

The following proposition, directly, follows from the definition.

Proposition 4 *Let G and H be arbitrary graphs and $\|G\| = \sqrt{G.G}$. Then,*

a) $G.H = H.G$

b) $G.H = \overline{G}.\overline{H}$.

c) $G.\overline{H} = \overline{G}.H = -G.H$.

d) $-1 \leq \frac{G}{\|G\|} \cdot \frac{H}{\|H\|} \leq 1$

e) $\frac{G}{\|G\|}\cdot\frac{H}{\|H\|}=1$ *if and only if* $G\cong H$.

f) $\frac{G}{\|G\|}\cdot\frac{H}{\|H\|}=-1$ *if and only if* $G\cong\overline{H}$.

g) $\frac{G}{\|G\|}\cdot\frac{H}{\|H\|}=\frac{\|H\|}{\|G\|}$ *if and only if* H *is a subgraph of* G.

h) If H *is a subgraph of* G*, then phase*$(G.H)$*/Aut*(H) *is the number of occurrences of the subgraph* H *in* G. □

In addition, the dot product extension makes it possible to reformulate some known graph parameters. please see Appendix.

2.3 Coordinate representation and graph basis

We saw how dot prdoct of a pair of graphs reveals significant information about the structure of a pair of graphs, such as being isomorphic, close to isomorphic or completely far structure by orthogonality. Now, we want to identify a graph according to its dot product by a a set of graphs.

Definition 7 *Let* $S=(H_1,..,H_t)$ *be an ordered set of graphs. The* ***coordinates of a graph*** G *with respect to the set* S *is* $(H_1.G,\cdots,H_t.G)$.

Definition 8 *Let* Γ *be a set of graphs. A set* S *of graphs is a* ***basis*** *for* Γ*, if any graph in* Γ *has a unique coordinates with respect to* S.



Figure 2: A basis for 6-vertex graphs

A set of graphs is a basis for itself. Thus, the basis for a set of graphs is well defined. A basis for 6-vertex graphs is shown in Fig. 2. The coordinate representation of graphs is a useful tool to deal with graphs. Two isomorphic graphs have the same coordinates, thus, to examine the isomorphism of two graphs, it is enough to check equality of their coordinates. Also, the coordinates of graphs indicate how similar two graphs are. In the next section, we deal with the application of the defined graph coordinate system.

3 Graph isomorphism and related problems

The coordinate representation of graphs is introduced in the previous section. Now, we use this representation for graph isomorphism and related problem. In the conventional approach for graph isomorphism, one tries to find a one to one correspondence between the vertices of two graphs. Against, in a coordinate system with a basis, it is sufficient to compute the coordinates and compare them. We explain why these new approach outperforms the traditional approach.

Although, computing the dot product of two graphs, in general, is as hard as graph isomorphism problem, but, the basis is a fixed set of graphs. The fixedness of basis graphs is the outstanding advantage of this new approach. For example, in practice, the fixedness of basis elements makes it possible to have some pre-computations, if it is needed, or even have a dedicated physical infrastructure which compute the dot product of any graphs with a fixed basis element. The implementation of this infrastructure is given in Fig. 3.
More importantly, the basis elements can be chosen cleverly to decrease the computational complexity. For example, there are graphs that the computational complexity of their dot product to any arbitrary graph is polynomial time, such as bounded order graphs, star graphs S_k, $K_r \cup K_{n-r}$ or $K_r \cup \overline{K}_{n-r}$($r$ is a fixed integer). We will see in the following that it is possible to have a basis for almost every n-vertex graph such that the computational complexity of dot product of any basis element with any arbitrary graph can be done in quasi-polynomial time. Therefore, such basis provides a quasi-polynomial time graph isomorphism for almost any pair of n-vertex graph.



Figure 3: A framework for solving the graph isomorphism problem or graph matching (H_i s are basis elements)

Another application of the defined graph coordinate system is graph clustering, i.e. classifying a set of graphs according to their class of isomorphism. Assume we have a set of m n-vertex graphs and we want to classify them into isomorphism classes. We need to compare any pair of graphs. Hence, the algorithm of checking isomorphism of two graphs should be called in the order of $O(m^2)$ times in average. Against, using the graphs coordinates, it is

sufficient to find the graph coordinates for all graphs of the set and compare them. Thus, the new representation reduces a problem of order $O(m^2)$ to a logarithmic problem in terms of m.
The graph coordinate representation is useful not only in graph isomorphism problem, but also in graph matching and graph similarity problems. The closer coordinates, the more similar structure. Therefore, the coordinate system of graphs , also, benefits us in classifying and clustering graphs in inexact cases.

3.1 A basis for almost every n-vertex graph

The coordinate representation of graphs provides us with a framework to investigate the computational complexity of graph isomorphism problem. Here, we introduce a basis for almost every n-vertex graph which easily results in $\exp(6 \log n)$ for computational complexity of GI problem for almost every pair of n-vertex graphs.
To study the computational complexity of the graph isomorphism problem, we should find a suitable basis for graphs. For instance, if we can find a basis whose cardinality is a polynomial in terms of n and the dot product of any graph with basis elements can be done in polynomial time in terms of n, in fact, we have found a polynomial time algorithm for the graph isomorphism problem.

Let S be the set of graphs on at most $3 \log n$ vertices. We show that almost every n-vertex graph has a unique coordinates with respect to S. Thus, S is a basis for almost every graph in Γ_n.

Theorem 2 *The set of graphs with at most* $3 \log n$ *vertics is a basis for almost every* n*-vertex graphs.*

To prove the above theorem, we need the following lemma. A unique subgraph of a graph is a subgraph which occurs just once in a graph. Such subgraph is called a graph anchor in [8]. The idea of this proof is close, but more general than Babai et al. [1].

Lemma 1 *Almost every* n*-vertex graph has an asymmetric unique subgraph such that* $|V(H)| = 3 \log n - k$ *and no pair of vertices in* $V(G) - V(H)$ *have the same neighbors in* H*.(*k *is a fixed integer)*

Proof: Let G be a graph on n vertices. It has

$$N = \binom{n}{3 \log n - k} \approx 2^{3 \log^2 n - k \log n} / (3 \log n - k)! \approx 2^{3 \log^2 n}$$

subgraphs with $3 \log n - k$ vertices. But, we have

$$|\Gamma_{3 \log n - k}| \approx 2^{4.5 \log^2 n - 3k \log n + .5k^2} / (3 \log n - k)! \approx 2^{4.5 \log^2 n}$$

number of different graph isomorphism classes for graphs on $3\log n-k$ vertices. Therefore, since $N << |\Gamma_{3\log n-k}|$, almost always there exists a subgraph H on $3\log^2 n-k$ vertices which has a unique isomorphism class. In addition, we know that almost all finite graphs are asymmetric. Thus, the subgraph H which is an arbitrary graph, is almost always asymmetric. Now, we should prove that almost always any vertex out of H has a unique neighbors set on H, that is no pair of verices out of H have the same neighbors set in H. Since H has $3\log n$ vertices, there are $2^{3\log n}$ or n^3 possibilities for the neighbors set of any vertex which lies out of H. The probability that any vertex out of H chooses a particular subset of H is $p_n \approx n^3 \cdots (n^3-(n-3\log n+k))/n^{3(n-3\log n+k)}$. Thus, we have $p_n \approx n^3 \cdots (n^3-n)/n^{3n} \approx 1$ for large n. It means that almost always any vertex in $V(G)-V(H)$ has a specific set of neighbors in H. □

Proof of Theorem 2: We should prove that almost every n-vertex graph finds a unique coordinates with respect to the set of graphs on at most $3\log n$ vertices. Let G be an arbitrary n-vertex graph and $\Gamma_{\leq 3\log n}$ the set of graphs with at most $3\log n$ vertices. We denote the coordinates of G with respect to $\Gamma_{\leq 3\log n}$ by $(a_K)_{K\in\Gamma_{\leq 3\log n}}$ where $a_K=(G.K, Phase(G.K))$. According to Lemma 1, almost always graph G has a subgraph H with $3\log n-2$ vertices which is asymmetric and unique and all vertices out of H have different neighbors set on H. For any two vertices v and w in $V(G)-V(H)$, let H_{vw} be the induced subgraph on $V(H)\cup\{v,w\}$. Since, H is a unique subgraph and, also, for any $v,w\in V(G)-V(H)$ the neighbors set of v and w are specific, then, H_{vw} is, also, a unique subgraph. We show that a_H and $\{a_{H_{vw}}\}_{v,w\in V(G)-V(H)}$ are sufficient to determine G up to isomorphism. According to part (e) and (h) of Preposition 4, if K is a unique subgraph of G, then a_K indicates it. Thus, for any v and w out of H, $a_{H_{v,w}}$ indicates that H_{vw} is a unique subgraph of G. Since any vertex out of H has an specific neighbors set in H, thus, it is identified by its neighbors on H. Consequently, for any $v,w\in V(G)-V(H)$, $H_{v,w}$ determines the adjacency of v and w in G and, also, the neighbors of v and w in H. Thus, a_H and $a_{H_{vw}}$s determine G up to isomorphism. □

Corollary 2 *Graph isomorphism problem is solvable in* $\exp(6\log^2 n)$ *for almost every pair of* n*-vertex graphs.*

Proof: The computational complexity of computing $G.H$ where G is an arbitrary n-vertex graph and H is a graph with at most $3\log n$ vertices is at most $n^{3\log n}(=2^{3\log^2 n})$. And the number of basis elements, i.e. $|\Gamma_{\leq 3\log n}|$, is at most $\sum_{i\leq 3\log n} 2^{i(i-1)/2}/i! < 2^{4.5\log^2 n}/(3\log n)!$. Therefore, the complexity of computing the coordinates of any arbitrary n-vertex graph with respect to $\Gamma_{\leq 3\log n}$ is $2^{3\log^2 n}.2^{4.5\log^2 n}/(3\log n)! \approx \exp(5.2\log^2 n)$.□

References

[1] László Babai, Paul Erdős, and Stanley M Selkow. Random graph isomorphism. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 9(3):628–635, 1980.

[2] Horst Bunke and Kim Shearer. A graph distance metric based on the maximal common subgraph. *Pattern recognition letters*, 19(3):255–259, 1998.

[3] Terry Caelli and Serhiy Kosinov. Inexact graph matching using eigen-subspace projection clustering. *International Journal of Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence*, 18(03):329–354, 2004.

[4] Soumen Chakrabarti. *Mining the Web: Discovering knowledge from hypertext data*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2003.

[5] Donatello Conte, Pasquale Foggia, Carlo Sansone, and Mario Vento. Thirty years of graph matching in pattern recognition. *International journal of pattern recognition and artificial intelligence*, 18(03):265–298, 2004.

[6] Matthias Dehmer, Frank Emmert-Streib, and Olaf Wolkenhauer. Perspectives of graph mining techniques. *Rostocker Informatik Berichte*, 30(2):47–57, 2006.

[7] Paul Erdős, László Lovász, and Joel Spencer. Strong independence of graphcopy functions. *Graph Theory and Related Topics*, pages 165–172, 1979.

[8] Ameneh Farhadian. Reconstruction of graphs via asymmetry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01609*, 2016.

[9] Ameneh Farhadian. *Structural representation of graphs*. PhD thesis, Sharif University of Technology, 2017.

[10] Ralph J Faudree, Richard H Schelp, L Lesniak, András Gyárfás, and Jenö Lehel. On the rotation distance of graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 126(1):121–135, 1994.

[11] Xinbo Gao, Bing Xiao, Dacheng Tao, and Xuelong Li. A survey of graph edit distance. *Pattern Analysis and applications*, 13(1):113–129, 2010.

[12] Thomas Gärtner, Peter Flach, and Stefan Wrobel. On graph kernels: Hardness results and efficient alternatives. In *Learning Theory and Kernel Machines*, pages 129–143. Springer, 2003.

[13] WL Kocay. Some new methods in reconstruction theory. In *Combinatorial Mathematics IX*, pages 89–114. Springer, 1982.

[14] Si Quang Le, Tu Bao Ho, and TT Hang Phan. A novel graph-based similarity measure for 2d chemical structures. *GENOME INFORMATICS SERIES*, 15(2):82, 2004.

[15] László Lovász. *Large networks and graph limits*, volume 60. American Mathematical Soc., 2012.

[16] Bin Luo, Richard C Wilson, and Edwin R Hancock. Spectral embedding of graphs. *Pattern recognition*, 36(10):2213–2230, 2003.

[17] Michel Neuhaus and Horst Bunke. *Bridging the gap between graph edit distance and kernel machines*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., 2007.

[18] Kaspar Riesen and Horst Bunke. *Graph classification and clustering based on vector space embedding*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., 2010.

[19] Ali Shokoufandeh, Diego Macrini, Sven Dickinson, Kaleem Siddiqi, and Steven W Zucker. Indexing hierarchical structures using graph spectra. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, 27(7):1125–1140, 2005.

[20] Richard C Wilson, Edwin R Hancock, and Bin Luo. Pattern vectors from algebraic graph theory. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, 27(7):1112–1124, 2005.

[21] Bohdan Zelinka. On a certain distance between isomorphism classes of graphs. *Časopis pro pěstováni matematiky*, 100(4):371–373, 1975.

4 Appendix

In addition, the dot product extension makes it possible to reformulate some known graph parameters as follows
$\omega(G) = max\{m|\frac{K_m}{\|K_m\|}.\frac{G}{\|G\|} = \frac{\|K_m\|}{\|G\|}\}$,
$\alpha(G) = max\{m|\frac{K_m}{\|K_m\|}.\frac{G}{\|G\|} = -\frac{\|K_m\|}{\|G\|}\}$

Where $\omega(G)$ and $\alpha(G)$ are independence number and clique number of a graph G, respectively. We denote the disjoint union of some graphs by a diagonal block matrix which the matrix representation of graphs are its blocks and the entries corresponding to the connection of two different blocks are zero. Let $\bigcup_{i=1..m} K_{n_i}$ be the disjoint union of some complete graphs where $\sum_{i=1..m} n_i = n$, then for any n-vertex graph G, we have

$$\chi(G) = min\{m|(\bigcup_{i=1..m} K_{n_i}).G = \sum_{i=1..m} \|K_{n_i}\|^2\}$$

where $\chi(G)$ is the coloring number of graph G.